

To: Torchia, Carla (EC)[carla.torchia@canada.ca]
From: Korleski, Christopher
Sent: Tue 5/24/2016 8:17:36 PM
Subject: RE: Draft PROP

Thanks.

From: Torchia, Carla (EC) [<mailto:carla.torchia@canada.ca>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 2:42 PM
To: Korleski, Christopher <korleski.christopher@epa.gov>
Subject: FYI: Draft PROP

From: Goffin, Michael (EC)
Sent: May 24, 2016 2:17 PM
To: Torchia, Carla (EC)
Subject: Fw: Draft PROP

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Rogers network.

From: Goffin, Michael (EC) <michael.goffin@canada.ca>

Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 2:16 PM

To: Davis, Cameron

Subject: Re: Draft PROP

Yes, agree with your approach.

I just did a quick read as well. For the most part I don't believe what we have now

communicates a sense of the importance, the challenge or the accomplishment. AND as Canada looks to renew it's commitment to the Great Lakes this fall (hope to discuss further with you on margins of GLEC) I hope very much we can infuse these into the PROP. I will ask Carla to coordinate with Chris on getting PROP out (tomorrow?) with your suggested messaging.

RELATED. I also just read through the draft list of Binational Priorities for Science and Action that the Annex leads will present at GLEC. I have the same reaction as I did when reading the PROP. GLWQA describes these as "priorities for science and action to address current and future threats" and we have "public LAMP annual reports"... I hope we can find a way to reframe these in a manner that communicates the importance of what we do under the GLWQA. If you agree, would be good for us to have common messaging at GLEC.

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone on the Rogers network.

From: Davis, Cameron

Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:46 PM

To: Goffin, Michael (EC)

Subject: Draft PROP

Mike -- I want to ask your thoughts on something. The draft PROP has been distributed by Carla and Chris to you and me for review. I'm looking at it now. I would like to have it labeled as a preliminary draft and have it distributed to GLEC members and observers for input.

That said, it's not formatted or in shape that is typical of a draft release.

I think the pros outweigh the cons for distributing it with a caveat: (1) get early input to see if we're missing anything critical; (2) shows openness by EPA and ECCC to get early input; (3) the GLEC's role is to help guide major products like these things.

What do you think?

Cameron Davis
Senior Advisor to the Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(202) 564-7846
(312) 886-4957